

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 are pending in the present application.

I. ALLOWED CLAIMS

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 2-5 and 7 are allowable.

II. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly does not describe "impulse-type drive." The Examiner asserts that Figs. 12A and 12B do not give enough information. Applicant submits that the term "impulse-type drive" is well known and that one skilled in the art would understand this term. Therefore, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is improper.

III. FORMAL DRAWINGS

The Office Action does not indicate whether the formal drawings filed on March 24, 2003 have been approved, as Applicant requested in the amendment filed on

November 24, 2003 and December 8, 2004. **Applicant respectfully requests the**

Examiner to do so.

IV. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. Claims 1 and 8-12

Claims 1 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,094,216 (Taniguchi). This rejection is traversed.

Applicant submits that Taniguchi does not teach or suggest "shutting off images displayed in intervals between continuous frames," as recited by claim 1, on which claims 8-12 depend. This allows images displayed in intervals between continuous frames to be shut off even in an image display device that is driven by a hold-type drive, whereby substantial impulse-type drive can be attained. Rather, Taniguchi discloses a stereoscopic display apparatus for displaying a parallax barrier pattern consisting of a light-transmission portion and a light-shielding portion alternately arranged in order to provide a stereoscopic image display.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Taniguchi does not teach each and every feature of claims 1 and 8-12. Thus, the rejection of claims 1 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is overcome and should be withdrawn.

B. Claims 6 and 13

Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,828,427 (Faris). This rejection is traversed.

As presented above, Taniguchi does not teach or suggest to shut off images displayed in intervals between continuous frames, as recited by claim 1, on which claims 6 and 13 depend. Faris fails to make up for the above-noted deficiencies of Taniguchi. The Examiner does not assert that Faris teaches this feature of claim 1. Rather, the Examiner relies on Faris for the teaching of a flat panel display panel having direct and projection viewing modes of operation, and an electro-optical backlighting panel having a light emission state and a light transmission state.

Therefore, since the combination of Taniguchi and Faris fails to form the invention defined by claims 6 and 13, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is overcome and should be withdrawn.


Therefore, Applicant submits that the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that any of the outstanding issues could be resolved through a telephone interview, Applicant kindly requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Applicant believes that no additional fees are due for the subject application. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for

any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account
No. **04-1105**.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 12, 2005
Customer No.: 21874



John J. Penny, Jr. (Reg. No. 36,984)
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP
P.O. Box 55874
Boston, MA 02205
Tel.: (617) 517-5549
Fax: (617) 439-4170